

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,657	12/21/2000	Hidenori Nishikawa	JP9 1999 0204 US1	6991
7590 11/03/2003 Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC			EXAMINER	
			MAHMOUDI, HASSAN	
Three E-Comm Albany, NY 1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•	·		2175	12
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003	1/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/742,657	NISHIKAWA, HIDENORI
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tony Mahmoudi	2175
The MAILING DATE of this communicat		
THE REPLY FILED 22 October 2003 FAILS TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is requisinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1	PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN ired to avoid abandonment of the either: (1) a timely filed amendm of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (N CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. iis application. A proper reply to a nent which places the application in
<u>PERIOD</u> !	FOR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from th	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REF 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later tha earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	oire later than SIX MONTHS from the mail PLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH a). The date on which the petition under 3 and of extension and the corresponding amore shortened statutory period for reply origin	ling date of the final rejection. IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP IF CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under lially set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be en	ntered because:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would requ	ire further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (se	ee Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the app issues for appeal; and/or	lication in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without	it canceling a corresponding nur	nber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following	ing rejection(s):	·
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	_ would be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ re application in condition for allowance because	equest for reconsideration has be ause: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	een considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be consid raised by the Examiner in the final rejection		SOLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed ame explanation of how the new or amended of	· · · —	, _
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as	follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _	is a) □ approved or b) □	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure S	Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)
10. Other:		DOV POPOVICE
		SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINI TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/742,657





Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The newly added claim limitation of the node data for "use when" the first application program "is run, wherein the first hierarchical link table includes an identifier that identifies the first application program", and the limitation of the node data for "use when" the second application program "is run, wherein the second hierarchical link table includes an identifier that identifies the second application program", found in claim 6, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

The newly added claim limitation of "and wherein the node attributes comprise non-relational data", found in claim 7, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant's arguments presented in the After Final amendment, filed on 14-October-2003 have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, and/or have already been addressed by the examiner in the Final Rejection office action mailed on 13-August-2003 (paper Number 11.)

The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because the newly added claim limitations found in claims 6 and 7 raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and the claim limitations of the "finally rejected" claims are still met by the Mital et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,012), Fehskens et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,591), Suver (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,497), and Lynch-Aird (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,402) references.